

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the present application. The above amendments and following remarks do not raise significant new issues or require searching by the Examiner. Entry of this Amendment under Rule 116 is merited and reconsideration and allowance in view of the forgoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Status/Amendment

Claims 1, 14, 27, and 32 have been amended to correct typo error and to comply with antecedent basis rule, thereby improving claim language. The amended claims find solid support in the original specification and drawings. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments. Claims 1-5 and 8-36 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claims 1, 8-10, 22-24, 30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. (US Patent No. 6,684,087) in view of Nagata et al. (US Patent No. 6,701,017B1) and Sano et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0196970A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that Yu et al. teaches, at column 7, lines 1-25, the feature of independent claim 1, i.e., '*divide the high resolution picture data into the plurality of unit blocks of high resolution picture data*' (see the final Office Action, page 4, lines 1-2). Applicant respectfully traverses this Examiner's assertion for the following reasons.

Yu et al. discloses at column 7, lines 1-25 the preprocessing by ***reducing, decimating, or a linear interpolation approach*** for ensuring that ***a reformatted version of original image*** can be properly displayed on mobile terminal, and at column 8, lines 18-32 that ***the reduced image*** is inherently ***divided*** into a number of sub areas. In contrast, in amended claim 1, ***the original image***, i.e., ***the high resolution picture data*** received from the wireless transmitting/receiving unit or from at least one of the mobile communication terminal and the picture providing server is ***divided into*** the plurality of unit blocks. Therefore, the above feature of claim 1 is neither disclosed nor taught by Yu et al.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Yu et al. teaches, at column 7, lines 1-25, figures 5 and 7, the feature of ‘*output (generating) a high resolution partial picture of only a portion of the high resolution picture based upon the selected and extracted minimum number of unit blocks*’ in amended claim 1 (see the final Office Action, page 4, lines 8-11). Applicant respectfully traverses this Examiner’s assertion for the following reasons.

Yu et al. disclose at column 7, lines 1-25 “*The purpose of the preprocessing is to ensure that a reformatted version of image 500 can be properly displayed*” and “*One aspect of the preprocessing is to **reduce or decimate image** 500 to the size of 70 by 60 pixels. A **linear interpolation approach**, known to those skilled in the art, is used to **reduce image** 500.*” In view of the above disclosures of Yu et al., the reduction, decimate, or a linear interpolation approach causes the degeneration of the original image to be display on the mobile communication terminal. In contrast, in amended claim 1, *a high resolution partial picture which is only a part of the high resolution picture, i.e., the original picture is output based upon the selected and extracted minimum number of unit blocks which are parts of the original image.* Thus, the partial picture has the same resolution as the high resolution picture. Therefore, the above features of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor taught by Yu et al.

The Examiner further relies on Nagata et al. and Sano et al. to reject claim 1. Applicant, however, submits that Nagata et al. and Sano et al. also do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Yu et al. In view of the above, Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Sano et al., whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or teach the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 8-10 are patentable over Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Sano et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, each of amended independent claims 14, 27, and 32 has the same feature as that in the above feature of claim 1. Accordingly, 22-24, 30, and 33 depending on amended independent claims 14, 27, and 32, respectively are patentable over the applied art of record at least for the same reason advanced above with respect to claim 1.

2. Claims 2-5, 11-13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25-26, 28, 29, 31, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. in view of Nagata et al., Sano et al. and Lim (US Patent No. 7,233,807B2). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 2-5 and 11-13 depend from independent claim 1. Furthermore, claims 15-18, 21, and 25-26 depend from independent claim 14. Still furthermore, claims 28-29 and 31 depend from independent claim 27. Still furthermore, claims 34 and 35 depend from independent claim 32. As discussed above, Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Sano et al. fail to show or suggest at least the aforementioned feature of each of independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 32. Further, Lim fails to cure the deficiencies of Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Sano et al.

Therefore, Yu et al., Nagata et al., Sano et al., and Lim, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the feature of claims 1, 14, 27, and 32, and thus claims 1, 14, 27, and 32 are patentable over Yu et al., Nagata et al., Sano et al., and Lim. Therefore, claims 2-5, 11-13, 15-18, 21, 25-26, 28-29, 31, 34, and 35 depending from the corresponding independent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to respective independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 14, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. in view of Nagata et al. This rejection is traversed for the reasons stated below.

As discussed above, each of amended independent claims 14, 27, and 32 has the same feature as that in the above feature of claim 1. Therefore, Yu et al. and Nagata et al. are also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. in view of Nagata et al. and Minami (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0117407A1). This rejection is traversed for the reasons stated below.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 14. As discussed above, Yu et al. and Nagata et al. fail to show or suggest at least the aforementioned feature of independent claim 14. Further, Minami fails to cure the deficiencies of Yu et al. and Nagata et al.

Therefore, Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Minami, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the features of claim 14, and thus claim 14 is patentable over Yu et al., Nagata et al., and Minami. Therefore, Claims 19 and 20 depending from claim 14 are also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. in view of Nagata et al., Minami and Lim. This rejection is traversed for the reasons stated below.

Claim 21 depends from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claim 14 is patentable over Yu et al., Nagata et al., Minami and Lim. Thus, claim 21 depending from claim 14 is also patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 and 8-36 are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S. Ham/

Yoon S Ham

Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 22, 2011
YSH/DWK/jr